

Remarks

Claims 1-41 are pending. Claims 1, 15, 25 and 34 are independent.

The examiner indicated that the formal drawings submitted on March 12, 2004, were not acceptable because they failed to carry "Replacement Sheet" labels.

Applicant has re-submitted the same formal drawings, now with "Replacement Sheet" labels. No new matter was added.

The examiner objected to reference number 526 in FIG. 5D as not being described in the detailed description.

Applicant refers the examiner to paragraph [0121] as originally filed, reproduced below for the convenience of the examiner:

[0121] As illustrated, user interface 500c includes directory section 510 and work section 520. Work section 520 includes an attribute specification section 526, which allows the specification of attributes. As shown, section 526 includes a first section 527a, in which available attributes are displayed, and a second section 527b, in which the current attributes for the business object being modeled are shown. Section 526 allows attributes to be added/deleted by selection and command techniques, by drag and drop techniques, or by any other appropriate technique. Attributes may be full-blown business objects or objects that exist only in the context of another object. A decision may be made as to whether the values for dependent objects should be shared across objects or not.

The examiner objected to reference number 816 on FIG. 8K as not being described in the detailed description.

Applicant refers the examiner to paragraph [0153] as originally filed, reproduced below for the convenience of the examiner:

[0153] As illustrated, user interface 800b has a first portion 810, a second portion 812, a third portion 814, and a fourth portion 816. The illustrated guided procedure has a variety of steps, which portion 810 illustrates by the use of a procedure line. Currently, the employee hiring process has proceeded from initialization to hiring to preparing workspace, and is waiting for preparation of the collaborative environment for the new employee. Portion 812 lists the tasks to accomplish the current step, and portion 814 provides more detailed information regarding the tasks. Portion 816 lists resources, in this case people, for the user.

The examiner objected to the element labeled "HCM" in FIGs. 3 and 6 as not being defined in the specification.

Applicant believes that HCM, which refers to "Human Capital Management," is a well know acronym used by those skilled in this art. However, to clarify to those not skilled in this art, applicant has amended the specification. No new matter was added.

The examiner objected to the title of the invention.

Applicant has amended the title of the invention.

The examiner objected to the abstract because the first sentence, "Systems and techniques to develop and execute a composite application may include an application framework," is missing a verb.

Applicant submits to the examiner that the first sentence of the abstract contains a verb, and as such, is proper as written.

The examiner objected to the specification as containing one or more informalities.

Applicant has amended the specification to correct the informalities. No new matter was added.

The examiner rejected claims 1-41 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In summary, the examiner argues the claims are directed towards functional description matter per se, computer listings per se, and produce no tangible result.

Applicant knows of no legal requirement of producing a tangible result and that the patent office has been instructed not to use this ground as rationale for a 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection.

Claims 1 and 34, as amended, recite "a computer-implemented framework." Claim 15, as amended, recites "a computer-implemented method." Claims 1, 15 and 34 define processes implemented on a computer system. Any computer system includes physical components (machine hardware). Processes and machines are clearly patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Claim 25 recites "A computer program product, tangibly embodied in an information carrier, for providing a framework for a composite application, the computer program product being operable to cause data processing apparatus to..." A claim directed towards a computer program product is patentable subject matter under Ex parte Lungren (2005), In re Lowry, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994), and In re Beauregard, 53 F. 3d 1583 (Fed. Cir 1995).

Accordingly, claims 1, 15, 25 and 34 are proper under 35 U.S.C. §101.

The examiner uses Burke to reject claims 1, 2, 3, 5-13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21-26, 28 and 30-33 as having been anticipated.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "an object access layer operable to exchange data with a plurality of enterprise base systems and to present the data to a composite application through a uniform interface."

Burke fails to describe or disclose an object access layer. More specifically, Burke is devoid of an object access layer.

Claim 1, as amended, recites “a service layer operable to provide services to the composite application.” Burke fails to describe or disclose a service layer.

Burke merely discloses an application component layer, an application architecture layer and a technical architecture layer that makes up software architecture layers (Burke, FIG. 34) or a framework, without further explanation. In Burke’s FIG. 34, the application component layer is labeled as “customer profile / pricing / order capture / credit compose / clone / compare / find / derive / lifecycle.” The application architecture layer is labeled as “Workflow/business rules / security object / activity / associate / location / item demand / job / queue / statement / deliverable.” The technical architecture layer is labeled as “OS / GUI / network / APP server / web server RDBMS / OLIP / HW / ORB / security / TR / PA.” Burke provides no numerals for the layers in FIG. 34.

Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Burke.

Claims 15 and 25, as amended, recite “facilitating a user's interaction with the composite application through user interface patterns,” or similar language. Burke fails to describe or disclose this quoted claim feature.

To the contrary, Burke discloses patterns in the context of object definition/specification instances:

One preferred embodiment of a business object definition system in accordance with the invention uses Explorer or Instance Editor transactions (discussed below) to create machine processable, application independent, model definitions that capture knowledge as reusable chunks that become the patterns for all object definition/specification instances needed in the business. [Burke, col. 19, lines 6-12]

Accordingly, claims 15 and 25 are not anticipated by Burke.

The examiner uses Burke and Mukundan to reject claims 4, 20, 29, 34, 35, 36 and 38-41 as having been obvious.

Claim 1 (“an object access layer operable to exchange data with a plurality of enterprise base systems and to present the data to a composite application through a uniform interface”), claims 15 and 25 (“facilitating a user's interaction with the composite application through user interface patterns”) and claim 34 (“exchange data with a plurality of enterprise base systems, present the data to a composite application through a uniform interface, provide local persistency

in the database, and provide data synchronization and replication of enterprise base system data in the database”) are not obvious in view of Burke and Mukundan.

Burke was discussed above. Mukundan is no help. Mukundan fails to teach or suggest an object access layer. Mukundan fails to teach or suggest user interface patterns. Accordingly, claims 1, 15, 25 and 34 are not obvious in view of Burke and Mukundan.

Claims 4, 20, 29, 34, 35, 36 and 38-41, depend upon, and add further limitations to, claims 1, 15, 25 and 34. Accordingly, claims 4, 20, 29, 34, 35, 36 and 38-41 are not obvious in view of Burke and Mukundan.

The examiner uses Burke and Ireland to reject claims 14, 17 and 27 as having been obvious.

Claims 1, 15 and 25 are not obvious in view of Burke and Ireland. Burke was discussed above. Ireland is no help. Ireland’s framework appears to be shown in FIG. 2:

FIG. 2 illustrates the general structure of a Three-tier Database System 200 suitable for implementing the present invention. As shown, the system 200 comprises one or more Thin Client(s) 210 (e.g., Java client 211, ActiveX client 213, and PowerBuilder client 215) connected to Back End Servers (e.g., Sybase database server 231, mainframe (e.g., IBM DB2) 233, and Oracle database server 235) via a middle tier 220 comprising a Component Transaction Server (CTS) 221. In an exemplary embodiment, the Clients may themselves include standalone workstations, dumb terminals, or the like, or comprise personal computers (PCs) such as the above-described system 100. Typically, such units would operate under a client operating system, such as Microsoft Windows 9x for PC clients. Each Back End Server, such as Sybase.RTM, SQL Server.TM., now Sybase.RTM. Adaptive Server.TM. (available from Sybase, Inc. of Emeryville, Calif.) in an exemplary embodiment, generally operates as an independent process (i.e., independently of the Clients), running under a server operating system such as Microsoft Windows NT (Microsoft Corp. of Redmond, Wash.), NetWare (Novell of Provo, Utah), UNIX (Novell), or OS/2 (IBM). [Ireland, col. 6, lines 7-28]

No where does Ireland teach or suggest “an object access layer operable to exchange data with a plurality of enterprise base systems and to present the data to a composite application through a uniform interface” (claim 1), or “facilitating a user's interaction with the composite application through user interface patterns”(claims 15 and 25).

Claims 14, 17 and 27 depend upon, and add further limitations to, claims 1, 15 and 25. Accordingly, claims 14, 17 and 27 are not obvious in view of Burke and Ireland.

The examiner uses Burke, Mukundant and Ireland to reject claim 37 as having been obvious.

Inventor : Werner Aigner, et al
Serial No. : 10/657,726
Filed : September 8, 2003
Page : 17 of 17


Attorney Docket No. 103580.00029/2003P00303US

Claim 34 is not obvious in view of Burke, Mukundant and Ireland. Claim 37 depends upon, and adds further limitations to, claim 34. Accordingly, claim 37 is not obvious in view of Burke, Mukundant and Ireland.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 13, 2007


Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

Holland & Knight LLP
10 St. James Avenue
Boston, MA 02116
Tel. 617.573.5879
Fax 617.523.6850

4369117_v1